

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 9, 2006 in which claims 1-23 were rejected. With this response, claims 3 and 13 are cancelled with their limitations incorporated into their base claims 1 and 10, respectively. Claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-23, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

L Rejection of Claims 1,2, 4-10, 12-14 and 17-21 under 35 USC 102(E)
 Based upon Goodman

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejected Claims 1,2, 4-10, 12-14 and 17-21 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodman et al. US Patent 6,757,071. Claim 13 is cancelled. Independent claims 1 and 10 are amended to incorporate the limitations of cancelled dependent claims 3 and 13, respectively. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14 and 17-21, as amended, overcome the rejection based on Goodman.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of former dependent claim 3 which was rejected based upon Goodman in view of Torpey. Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for optimizing transparency printing. The method includes analyzing font sizes used in the document to determine whether formatting of the document is optimized for transparency printing.

Neither Goodman nor Torpey, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a method for optimizing transparency printing which includes analyzing font sizes used in a document to determine whether formatting of the document is optimized for transparency printing. As acknowledged by Section 7 of the Office Action which discussed the rejection of former claim 3 based on Goodman and Torpey, Goodman fails to disclose the step of analyzing the document comprising analyzing font sizes used in the document. As a result, the Office Action attempted to additionally rely upon Torpey by pointing to column 16, line 61-calm 17, line 28 of Torpey

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

and asserting that Torpey discloses the step of analyzing the document comprising analyzing font sizes.

However, Torpey does not disclose analyzing font sizes so as to determine whether formatting of a document is optimized for transparency printing. In contrast, Torpey merely discloses a method by which processes reducing inter-color bleeding (i.e., adjusting borders at black/color interfaces), under-printing and maintaining edge quality (i.e., adjusting borders that printed/non-printed interfaces) can be applied on an object oriented basis (see column 16, line 15-19 of Torpey). That portion of Torpey cited by the Office Action merely indicates that one of the classes of objects comprises text or objects having a certain font size threshold. In other words, if a certain object has a certain font size, a particular process for reducing inter-color bleeding, under printing and/or maintaining edge quality is applied. Like Goodman, discloses nothing about analyzing font size to determine whether the formatted font size is appropriate or optimized for transparency printing.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, that it would be obvious to modify Goodman based upon Torpey, the resulting hypothetical combination would not result in the analysis of font size to determine whether formatting of a document is optimized for transparency printing. In contrast, at most, the hypothetical combination would only analyze font size to determine which of the pixel management processes described by Torpey should be used to reduce inter-color bleeding, under-printing and to maintain edge quality. Neither Goodman nor Torpey appear to even recognize that to optimize transparency printing, the formatted font size should be analyzed. The only such teaching is found in Applicants' own disclosure. The Office Action's attempt to morph Goodman and Torpey into this claimed feature appears to be impermissibly using Applicants' own disclosure as a blueprint. Accordingly, Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the rejection based on Goodman and Torpey. Claims 2 and 4-9 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

B. Claim 10

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

Claim 10 is amended to incorporate the limitations of former dependent claim 13. Claim 10, as amended, recites a system for optimizing transparency printing which includes means for analyzing printing resolution to be used to print the document to determine whether the document formatting is optimized for transparency printing.

Goodman fails to disclose or suggest a system for optimizing transparency printing which analyzes the printing resolution to be used to determine whether document formatting is optimized for transparency printing. In contrast, the only factors that Goodman appears to analyze are color content and coverage content of the document to be printed. (See column 4, lines 19-25). Nowhere does Goodman disclose analyzing the printing resolution to determine whether document formatting is optimized for transparency printing.

In attempt to reject former claim 13 which recited means for analyzing printing resolution, the Office Action pointed to column 4, lines 1-4. However, this portion of Goodman does not disclose that such characteristics are analyzed to determine whether document formatting is optimized for transparency printing. In contrast, this portion of Goodman merely discloses that an image and color library 46 of a conventional printer driver 39 may perform enhancement functions on banded objects prior to sending the image to a spooler for printing. Goodman does not disclose that image resolution is analyzed to determine whether the image resolution is optimal for transparency printing. Accordingly, claim 10, as amended, overcomes the rejection based on Goodman. Claims 11-12 depend from claim 10 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

C. Claims 14 and 21

Claim 14 recite a method for optimizing transparency scanning which includes determining whether the scanning resolution is appropriate for scanning a transparency. Claim 21 recite a system for optimizing transparency scanning which includes means for determining whether the scanning resolution is appropriate for scanning a transparency.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

Goodman fails to disclose either a method or a system where a determination is made as to whether the scanning resolution is appropriate for scanning a transparency. In contrast, Goodman relates only to the printer driver for printing. Goodman is completely silent as to the scanning of a document. In rejecting claims 14 and 21, the Office Action points to column 4, lines 19-34; column 5, line 16-20 and column 4, lines 1-4. However, none of these portions of Goodman disclose anything about scanning a document. As noted above, each relates to printing a document, not scanning a document. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14 and 21 based upon Goodman should be withdrawn. Claims 17-20 depend from claim 14 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons.

II. Rejection of Claims 3 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Goodman And Torpey

Section 7 of the Office Action rejected claims 3 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as the unpatentable over Goodman and further in view of Torpey et al. US Patent 6,753,976. Claims 3 is canceled with its limitations incorporated into claim 1. Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 10. Torpey fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Goodman. Moreover, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, neither Goodman nor Torpey disclose analyzing font sizes used in a document to determine whether document formatting is optimized for transparency printing. Accordingly, claim 11 overcomes the rejection for this additional reason.

III. Rejection of Claims 15 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) Based on Goodman and Ellson

Section 9 of the Office Action rejected claims 15 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman and further in view of Ellson US Patenting 5,381,526. Claims 15 and 22 depend from claims 14 and 21, respectively. Claims 15 and 20 to overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 14 and 21. Ellson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Goodman.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

IV. Rejection of Claims 16 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) Based upon Goodman and Stewart

Section 10 of the Office Action rejected claims 16 and 23 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman and further in view of Stewart et al. US Patent 5,283,671. Claims 16 and 23 depend from claims 14 and 21, respectively and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 14 and 21. Stewart fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Goodman.

V. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-2, 4-12 and 14-23 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Atty. Dkt. No. 10015670-1

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 6, 2006

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276